VS.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,

10 T

26 /////

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS K. MILLS,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-0136 DFL CMK P

Defendants. ORDER

On April 8, 2005, plaintiff filed a "motion for an order of reference to the District Court for consideration and implementation of settlement agreement." That document was not served on defendants. Plaintiff is advised that every document submitted to the court for consideration must be served on defendants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5. Documents not to be served electronically are usually served by placing a copy in the U.S. mail. If an attorney has filed a document with the court on behalf of any defendants, then documents submitted by plaintiff must be served on that attorney and not on the defendants. Every document submitted conventionally to the court (e.g., by a prisoner proceeding pro se) must include a certificate stating the date an accurate copy of the document was mailed to defendants or their attorney and the address to which it was mailed. See Local Rule 5-135(b) and (c).

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's April 8, 2005 "motion
2	for an order of reference to the District Court for consideration and implementation of settlement
3	agreement" is denied without prejudice. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to properly serve any
4	documents subsequently filed in this action, and failure to include a proper certificate of service
5	with such filing, may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.
6	DATED: April 22, 2005
7	
8	
9	<u>/s/ CRAIG M. KELLISON</u> Craig M. Kellison
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11	/kf
12	mill0136.35
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	